

24



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,579	12/06/2000	James G. Hanko	007056-0127/P5556/BBC	3283

7590 08/13/2004

Brian M. Berliner, Esq.
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/733,579

Applicant(s)

HANKO ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 19-33 are pending in this Office Action.

Claims 1-18 are canceled.

The new abstract is accepted in light of the amendment.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 19-20, 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,748,189 by Trueblood (Applicant IDS).

Regarding claim 19, a method for associating multiple display units in a grouped server environment (Trueblood: col. 4, lines 54-59), the method comprising:

identifying when a secondary Human Interface Device is connected with a first sever (Trueblood: col. 8, lines 40-42);

determining whether a primary Human Interface Device associated with said secondary Human Interface Device is displaying a first part of an associated active session (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 45-61);

performing a first action, if said primary Human Interface Device is displaying said first part of said associated active session (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 5-15); and

displaying a second part of said associated active session on said second Human Interface Device (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 5-15; new screen);

wherein said first part of said associated active session is different from said second part of said associated active session (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 16-31; different screens, lines 58-67); and

wherein said first action comprises:

determining a second server for providing said first session associated active session (Trueblood: col. 11, lines 1-5);

determining whether said first and second servers are the same server (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 61- col. 8, line 13); and

redirecting said connection of said secondary Human Interface Device to said second server, if said first and second servers are not the same server (Trueblood: col. 8, lines 58-62).

Regarding claim 20, the method of Claim 19, further comprising:

augmenting said associated active session to indicate that said first and second server are the same server (Trueblood: col. 12, lines 56- col. 13, lines 10).

Regarding claim 27, the method of Claim 19, wherein said primary and secondary Human Interface Devices are associated to simulate a multi-head display unit (Trueblood: col. 5, lines 31-51).

Regarding claim 28, the method of Claim 19, wherein the steps of the method are performed by a computer-readable code (Trueblood: col. 8, lines 12-15).

Regarding claim 29, the method of Claim 19, wherein said primary Human Interface Device provides a network interface to a user (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 43-50) and wherein said second server provides a plurality of computational services removed from said primary Human Interface Device to said user (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 43-61).

Regarding claim 30, the method of Claim 29, wherein said plurality of computational services comprise a computational power for said primary Human Interface Devices and a state maintenance for said primary Human Interface Devices (Trueblood: col. 8, lines 40-57; col. 2, lines 35-47).

Regarding claim 31, the method of Claim 19 with primary and secondary Human Interface Devices are stateless devices (Trueblood: col. 8, lines 13-27, lines 30-57; X-server does all the processing and work).

Regarding claim 32, the method of Claim 19, wherein each of said primary and secondary Human Interface Devices comprises only a single framebuffer card for display (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 62-67; Figure 5; col. 7, lines 66- col. 8, lines 4).

Regarding claim 33, the method of Claim 19, wherein said associated active session displays a large computing environment as separate parts (Trueblood: col. 6, lines 53-60; Figure 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,748,189 by Trueblood in view of U. S. Patent No 5,392,400 by Berkowitz et al

Regarding claim 21, the Trueblood reference teaches a method for associating multiple display units in a grouped server environment.

The Trueblood reference does not explicitly state not having an associated session.

The Berkowitz reference teaches performing a second action (Berkowitz: col. 5, lines 27-43), if said primary Human Interface Device does not have said associated active session (Berkowitz: col. 5, lines 27-33).

The Berkowitz reference further teaches the invention runs with X window components implementing a multi-windowed graphical user interface (Berkowitz: col. 3, lines 15-22, 46-50).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create method for associating multiple display units in a grouped server environment as taught by Trueblood while employing a second action as taught by Berkowitz in order to expand on the X window components implementing a multi-windowed graphical user interface and overcome platform specific limitations (Berkowitz: col. 1, lines 53-61; col. 3, lines 15-22, 46-50).

Claims 22-26 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Trueblood and Berkowitz.

Regarding claim 22, the method of Claim 21, wherein said second action comprises:

performing a special session for said secondary Human Interface Device (Berkowitz: col. 2, lines 31-35).

Regarding claim 23, the method of Claim 22, wherein said special session comprises:

indicating on said secondary Human Interface Device that said secondary Human Interface Device is waiting to find said primary Human Interface Device (Berkowitz: col. 5, lines 40-43).

Regarding claim 24, the method of Claim 23, comprises:

wherein said special session further determining whether said primary Human Interface Device is displaying said first part of said associated active session after performance of said special session (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 45-61); and

exiting said special session (Berkowitz: col. 9, lines 37-46), if said primary Human Interface Device is displaying said first pad of said associated active session (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 45-61).

Regarding claim 25, the method of Claim 24, wherein said special session further comprises:

performing the steps in said first action, if said primary Human Interface Device is displaying said first part of said associated active session (Trueblood: col. 9, lines 5-15).

Regarding claim 26, the method of Claim 25, wherein said special session further comprises:

repeating the steps in said special session until said primary Human Interface Device is displaying said first part of said associated active session (Berkowitz: col. 5, lines 40-45; Figure 4).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2155

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number is (703) 305-0324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on (703) 308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb
August 6, 2004

brb



HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER